

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**Status of the Application**

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-25 were pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-11 and 15-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,108,540 (Sonti), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,913,165 (Foti). Claims 3 and 7 were rejected under § 103 as unpatentable over Sonti (and presumably Foti) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,379 (Dougherty). Claims 12-14 and 25 were rejected under § 103 as unpatentable over the combination of Sonti and Foti, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,958,016 (Chang).

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 23 have been amended and new claims 26-29 have been added. Hence, after entry of this amendment, claims 1-29 will stand pending in the application. The claim amendments herein (but not new claims 26-29) were first submitted in an Amendment after Final on October 30, 2003 but were refused entry in an Advisory Action dated November 10, 2003. Undersigned counsel thanks the Examiner for his courtesy and professionalism during the short telephone call on November 13, 2003.

**New claims:**

New claims 26-29 have been added, and it is submitted that the new claims recite additional patentable limitations, as discussed in detail below. It is further submitted that support for the new claims can be found, *inter alia*, in existing claims 1 and 6, as well as at page 6, lines 1-2 and page 7, lines 1-3.

**Claim Rejections:**

All pending claims have been rejected under § 103 as unpatentable over the combination of Sonti and Foti, along with, in some cases, other references. The applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and submits the following arguments in support of his position.

The applicant submits that the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of even the independent claims pending in the application. For example, as amended, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "in response to the request and without

prompting by any Switching Center, sending the profile update to the Switching Center.” In a previous amendment (Paper No. 6), the applicant pointed out that Sonti neither teaches nor suggests updating a profile at a switching center without any prompting by that switching center. Apparently accepting that argument, the current office action attempts to combine Sonti with Foti, which teaches updating a profile at a switching center in response to prompting from a different switching center. Nonetheless, even assuming there would be some motivation to combine Sonti and Foti (and the office action provides no evidence or rationale for any such motivation) neither Sonti nor Foti teach or even suggest sending a profile update to a switching center in response to a request from a database without prompting from any switching center. In other words, the office action has identified nothing in either Sonti or Foti that would even suggest to one skilled in the art any method of prompting a profile update other than by a request from an MSC, let alone the limitation of claim 1, quoted above. Moreover, for at least the reasons discussed in the previous response, there would be no motivation to modify the combination of Sonti and Foti to send updates in the claimed manner, and the cited combination fails to render obvious even the independent claims in the application.

The advisory action asserted that, according to the teaching of Foti, “[w]hen located WITHIN their home location, the MSC is NOT prompted by any other MSC. It merely makes the profile updates directly.” The applicant respectfully submits that the advisory action misperceives either the claimed invention or the cited reference. While the applicant agrees with the Advisory Action’s assertion that the MSC makes the profile updates “directly,” (*i.e.*, without interaction from another MSC) it does so by “send[ing] a feature request invoke message having a service feature change and MIN to the HLR.” (col. 2, lns.32-35). That is, the MSC prompts the HLR to make a feature request, similar to the teaching of Sonti (col. 8, lns. 40-44): “The mobile switching center . . . sends the remaining digits . . . to the HLR in the form of a “FEATREQ” message.”

Thus, both Sonti and Foti teach that that an MSC (either the home MSC or a roaming MSC) must prompt the HLR to provoke a change in a subscriber profile. This clearly is distinct from the limitations of claim 1, which recites, *inter alia*, “in response to the request and without prompting by any Switching Center, sending the profile update to the Switching Center.”

Thus, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over any combination of Sonti and Foti. For at least similar reasons, the other independent claims in the application are allowable.

Further, the applicant believes that the dependent claims are allowable both as depending from allowable base claims and as being directed to specific novel substitutes. For instance, claim 14 recites, *inter alia*, that “the database is configured to receive communications via a web browser, and wherein receiving an update comprises receiving an update request initiated by a web browser.” The office action asserts that Chang could be combined with Sonti and Foti to teach the claimed invention. Chang, however, is directed to web-based modification of features of wireline (and specifically AIN) telephone service. Further, Chang does not even mention wireless subscriber profiles or service location registers, let alone teach or even suggest using the web to modify a subscriber profile in a wireless network. For this reason, even if Chang and Sonti/Foti, which are directed to different types of networks, could be combined, the combination still would fail to teach the limitations of claim 14.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the final rejections of claims 1-25.

New independent claims 26 and 28 are patentable over the cited art for at least the above reasons, as well as the following additional reasons. Claim 26 recites, *inter alia*, “using a database client connection from a service center to update a database regarding a change in the subscriber’s profile . . . .” It is submitted that none of the cited references teach or suggest this additional limitation; for instance, neither Sonti nor Foti even appear to mention a database client for updating a database. For similar reasons, claim 28 is patentable over the cited references. Dependent claims 27 and 29 are allowable as depending from allowable base claims as well as being directed to specific novel substitutes. Hence, the applicant submits that new claims 26-29 are allowable for these additional reasons.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the applicants believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests an action to that end. If the

Appl. No. 09/648,908  
Amdt. dated November 19, 2003

PATENT

Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Chad E. King  
Reg. No. 44,187

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 303-571-4000  
Fax: 415-576-0300

CEK:nmb  
60085878 v1